

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

ROBERT OLLIE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARCUS HODGE, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 3:13-cv-1181-NJR-DGW

ORDER

WILKERSON, Magistrate Judge:

Now before the Court is the Motion to Compel filed by Plaintiff Robert Ollie on August 7, 2015 (Doc. 90). For the reasons set forth below, the Motion is **DENIED**.

In his motion to compel, Plaintiff complains that Defendants failed to adequately respond to his requests for production of documents. Plaintiff explains that despite his efforts to informally resolve the disputes and obtain the documents he seeks, Defendants have failed to provide him with relevant documents. Specifically, Plaintiff complains that Defendant Stafford has not provided him with the requested discovery and that all Defendants failed to provide him with the requested surveillance footage from November 19, 2011, as well as various incident reports and meeting reports. Plaintiff also takes issue with Defendants' objections to his request for documents concerning complaints of mistreatment (i.e. racial discrimination, retaliation, or harassment). Plaintiff did not attach his requests for documents, nor Defendants' responses, to his motion; as such, the Court is limited in its ability to ascertain, with specificity, precisely what documents Plaintiff seeks.

Defendants responded to Plaintiff's motion on August 21, 2015 (Doc. 91). Attached to

Defendants' response is Plaintiff's request for production of documents served April 30, 2014 (Doc. 91-1), and Defendants' responses thereto (Doc. 91-2). A review of these documents reveals that Defendants properly responded to Plaintiff's requests within the prescribed thirty day timeframe. Defendants' responses appear reasonable, and the Court finds that Defendants' objections were valid. The Court notes that in response to Plaintiff's requests numbered two, six, and eleven Defendants indicated they would supplement their response upon receipt of documentation responsive to this request. In their response to Plaintiff's motion, Defendants admitted that they never supplemented their responses, but indicated they would do so within twenty-one days. Based on this representation, the Court presumes that Plaintiff has either received any supplemental documents or has been notified that no supplemental documents exist. Defendants are reminded that supplementation of discovery responses is *mandatory* pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e), not discretionary. Based on the record before the Court, there does not appear to be a basis for Plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. 90); therefore, it is **DENIED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 18, 2015



DONALD G. WILKERSON
United States Magistrate Judge